

REMARKS

Claims 12-14 and 17-22 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of June 14, 2007, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Amendment

Claims 1-10, 11, 15 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 12 and 17, directed to a method for inhibiting radical reaction, have been amended by incorporating into these claims the limitations of claim 1. New claims 18-22, which correspond to cancelled claims 2-6. These new claims all depend from claim 12, which claim has been deemed to be allowable over the prior art cited.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 8-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As the present amendment cancels claims 8-10 and 15, this rejection is now moot with respect to those claims.

With respect to claim 13, it is said that the term "high molecules" renders the claim indefinite. Accordingly, the term "high molecules" has been deleted from claim 13. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment is sufficient to overcome the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubota et al., EP 1,284,286.

As the present amendment cancels claims 1-11, this rejection is now moot.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latamer, U.S. 2,487,931 in view of Kubota.

As the present amendment cancels claim 16, this rejection is now moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has found claim 12 to be allowable over the prior art of record. Dependent claims 13-15 are said to be allowable if the 112 rejections are overcome.

Accordingly, claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 from which claim 12 had depended. It is believed that claims 13, 14 and 17-22, all of which depend from claim 12, are also allowable.

Appln. No. 10/525,839
Amd. dated December 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 14, 2007

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now
in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: /Anne M. Kornbau/
Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\SUMA\oku7\pto\2007-12-10AMD.doc